



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

T. Lucreti Cari de rerum natura libri sex. Edidit ADOLPHUS BRIEGER.
Lipsiae in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, MDCCCXCIV. 12mo, pp. lxxxiv,
206. m. 1.80.

For forty years in Germany Lucretius has been read and cited by the editions of Lachmann and Bernays, and, consequently, the numerous emendations made by Munro, as well as the criticisms of a long line of German scholars like Polle, Winckelmann, Hoerschelmann, Christ, not to mention Woltjer and other Netherlanders, have never been incorporated into a standard text. For, while Munro's edition has been for many years, and will continue to be, the standard edition for English-speaking people, it has had a limited circulation in Germany; although it is well known, and has even been translated, in France. Bockemueller's edition (Stade, 1874), with its unfortunate theory of composition, its rash emendations, violent transpositions and numerous errors, is practically unknown, except to professed Lucretian scholars. Hence, for Germany, at least, a new recension of Lucretius was much to be desired. Brieger for years has been the Lucretian contributor to the *Jahresbericht*, and previously to the publication of that important journal had contributed several articles to the *Philologus*; and he himself tells us that the present recension represents 38 years of continued study. Twenty years ago this edition was promised, and, moreover, it was to include an exegetical commentary, which is still to come. And when we consider that Munro gave practically his whole life to Lucretian study, one shrinks from the inevitable comparison of the work of two such men.

The prolegomena of 84 pages falls into two parts: the first third gives the general principles upon which the recension is made, and the remainder a detailed statement of the changes in the readings, with the authority therefor; for very many of the emendations were made by other scholars. Unfortunately, in the prolegomena the number of the book cited was not placed at the top of the page, so that reference back from the text to the appropriate passage of the prolegomena is difficult. But the prolegomena as a whole is the best index available for the numerous Lucretian contributions distributed since Lachmann through the philological literature of Germany and England.

Brieger's recension, like Munro's, is a continuation of the principles laid down by Lachmann. The two Leyden manuscripts are the foundation of the text. Lachmann was a man 'divini ingenii,' and Bernays' independence is justly praised. As for Munro 'ubi erravit, quod non raro accidit, ut homo venia dignus est.' Munro differs from Bernays in 355 places; he restored the MS reading against Lachmann in 155 places. Brieger underestimates Munro's knowledge of the philosophy; one part of the task was nearly finished by Lachmann, the other hardly begun, he says; and since Gassendi, no one has

explained the entire Epicurean physiology from the sources; and so, he continues, *more Germanico*, 'nihil relinquebatur nisi ut ipse quid in ea re efficere possem experirer.' We shall eagerly await his commentary. Munro's readings are occasionally misstated in the prolegomena, and numerous emendations are passed over without remark. The comments on some rejected readings are worthy of Lambinus and Gifanius: M. writes *perverso*, *parum eleganter*, *inepte*; it is pleasanter to read in other places *egregie*, *felici audacia*. It should be remembered that many of Brieger's readings were known to Munro; indeed, the great majority; for instance, *conexa* in II 268 is to Br. 'rectissime,' to M. 'absurd.'

In the orthography Brieger has done well to reject M.'s *vocaret* for *vacaret*, *lucunas*, *reprehendere*, *aliut*, *adque*, *ni* for *ne* (III 286), *taetro*, *frudi*; it is remarkable that he prints *voluntati* (abl.) II 270, *acuae* (even if it is trisyllabic in VI 576), and *duellum* IV 949—the last a most desirable correction. Following Lachmann, he continues to separate words like *nimirum*, *praeterquam*. He always prints *aëra* with the diaeresis, as he should, and joins *est* to the preceding word whenever possible, instead of following the MSS, as M. did, who made the juncture only when the MSS served as a precedent. In other matters, too, M. is more faithful to the codices, and Brieger's edition is worthless in fine matters of MSS reading. To illustrate, I 742 Br. has *quicquam*, M. *quicquam*; 752 *habebis*, *habebis*; 753 *veneno*, *veneno*; VI 244 *gignier*, *gignier*. But in punctuation, as a whole, Brieger is superior to M.; Munro, like Lachmann, wrote *nimis regie*, and scorned the assistance of the humble comma in too many places; indeed, his translation is nearly unreadable for that reason; yet when he wished to advocate a particularly devious and thorny interpretation, he is lavish with his points; Br. justly criticises his *confercit*, *franguntur*, *in artum*, *concreti* etc. VI 156. Br. has uniformly a closer pointing; a good example is I 106 sq. There are cases where the interpretation depends on the punctuation, as, for instance, IV 991, where Br. joins the *ibidem* with *tollunt*. But in the majority of places Brieger's additional pointing does not change the sense.

It appears that Lucretian editors have not that abhorrence of a vacuum sometimes attributed to nature. Lachmann indicates 12 lacunae, Bernays 16, Munro 29 and Brieger 70. We cannot feel that even Munro was right in finding so many chasms; and with Brieger, even more, the difficulty could have been met by emendation; as, for example, in II 381, where Br. keeps the *animi ratione* of the MSS, inferring a preceding gap, and rejecting L.'s *tali*, which was accepted by Munro. Sometimes Br. infers a lacuna and brackets it with the following verse, as in III 297–8. One cannot discuss all the many cases here; the one at I 915, where the defence is, doubtless, that *quod superest* is there un-Lucretian, I should reject decidedly; II 477, on the other hand, I should retain, and also the one at V 684. The bracketing of passages is also carried to a great extent, more than seems justified in the recension of an author. In the case of a poem confessedly so incomplete as the *De rerum natura*, the marking off of passages as interrupting the thought is really finishing the poet's work for him, and is but a degree removed from rewriting the poem. Such comments properly belong in the commentary; and the same remarks apply to transposition of passages, which is only to be applied

when the disturbance is due to the copyist and not to the poet. I can see, then, no justification for marking off verses 6-9 of the first book, nor for much of the shifting about in the 4th and 6th books.

Although a comparison of Brieger's text with Munro's shows changes on every page, yet Brieger is rather conservative than radical. Again and again he impales a word as corrupt, neither himself emending nor accepting the suggestions of others; so he prints †*speciem* I 315, †*videntur* II 422, †*sensu* II 810, †*suadet* III 84; I should add others to the list, like *par vis*, MS (*partis*, Br.), V 868, where M. reads *visque*, and, perhaps, *oris* VI 552 for *oras* of the MSS. He has repeatedly followed M. in restoring the MS reading against Lachmann, and the impression which, on the whole, he creates is that of one *pedetemptim progredientis*. As for the emendations differing from Munro's, which he has made or accepted, some are unquestionably good, others just as decidedly bad, and several doubtful—as might be expected in a work of such scope and difficulty. *Aves* for *ames* IV 1037, *tulit ut nequeat* (Bentley) 5, 823, *aetus* for *aestus* 5, 796, *repertas* for *reperta* V 1373, *fata* for *facta* V 1327, I should favor; but *gnatis* is flat in III 959; *cunctere* for *cunctare* VI 792, Lotze's *ex ea* IV 110, *Parium marmorque deorum* IV 79, and many more, have little to recommend them.

It was most unfortunate that Brieger, in the numbering of his lines, has not only introduced a new numbering of his own, but has also retained the numbering of Lachmann and Bernays: Brieger's figures are to the left, Lachmann's to the right, and Bernays to the left again in italic type; when the numbers agree there is no difficulty, for then but one set is printed; but over in the fourth book, where each editor differs from the other, there results such an *aestus mentis* as Lucretius never dreamed of. Doubtless the large number of typographical or other errors is due to this confusion; in the prolegomena the quotation, while theoretically according to Br., is sometimes by Lm., sometimes by B., and sometimes by neither. More than once the editor substitutes in the prolegomena a new reading for that in the text, and critical notes are occasionally altogether omitted. For example, in IV 1101 the MSS have *unguenta*; Br. reads with Lachm. *argentum*; and, of course, having no critical note, does not notice M.'s *huic lenta*. The editor's intention was to state his variants from Lachmann and Bernays rather than to give all the MS readings, as Munro has done.

As this edition is a part of the Teubner Text Series and will probably be circulated for many years, I append a list of corrigenda: Page i, Munro edited L. first in 1860, not 1866 (misprint); xi, read 525 for 524, 284 for 282, 783 for 793; xvi, the numbers are by Lm.; xvii, by Br.; xviii, 741 add 723 Br.; xix, 755 add 748 Br., as the discussion is given by Brieger's numbering, VI 1057 should be 1067 Lm. or 1058 Br.; the references on p. xix are very puzzling; he cites by Lachmann VI 456, comparing *infra quae scribam*, i. e. 449 Br.; the next reference, I 50, is to Brieger again (here write *omnis—res*), and the second to Bernays IV 344, which should be 321 Lm. or 329 Br.; p. xx, I 189 is presumably to Lm. again, although the verse is 188 Lm. B., 182 Br., while the next is to Br. and a misprint as well: read I 443 for IV 443; IV 66 should be 60, IV 266 should be 267; xxi, 1030 should be 1024 Br. or 1028 Lm.; xxii, 135 should be 138, *imprimis* (cf. 4, 138) should be *in primis*; xxiii, 570-577 should

be 601-608 Br. or 577-584 Lm.; xxiv, 454 is Lm., change to 448 Br.; xxvii, V 1013 add Lm., for 524 read 525; VI 324 is Lm., add 320 Br.; 760 should be 761, 134 should be 129 Br. or 135 Lm.; xxviii, 488-503 should be 485-490 (487 sq. Lm.); xxxvii, VI 358 should be 348 Lm. or 344 Br.; xxxviii, add Lm. after 577-583; xxxix, III 1019 should be 1010; 778 should be 772, 869 should be 864; xl, 918 should be 913, 971 "*officiatque, quominus in officiatque* (Gryph. Lugdunens.) mutandum non esse docet Munro in ed. quarta." But Br. has in the text *efficiatque quo minu'*, which is the MSS reading, while Munro in ed. 4 prints and defends *officiat*; xli, 171 should be 169, 1097 should be 1069, *ipa* should be *ipsa*, 'fulget auroque Lm. Mr.', but Lm. reads *fulgenti*; perhaps Lm. here means Lambinus, who read *fulget*; xlii, 'vers. 69-79 etc.', wholly unintelligible, unless 55-61 is meant; 103 should be 104; xliii, 'conexaque OQ' Lm. and M. give *conexa* as the reading, 395 should be 305, '724 . . . v. infra,' there is no *infra*, as the verse is omitted by Br. in his text; xlv, add Lm. after 477; xlv, 660 should be 680 and note should read 655-659, 680, 652 Lm.; xlvii, add Lm. after 825; xlviii, 1001 sq. M. reads *effit ut omnes res ita, not efficit*, etc., as is stated, 1030 M. reads *nunc*, not *sint*; xlix, M. reads *hic* . . . *abundans*, not as stated, 1116 M. claims *hic*, which is credited to Christ; insert Mr. after *evertere suadet*; l, VI 1057 should be 1058; li, M. reads *expellitur*, not *pellitur*; lii, 442 should be 443, insert B. after *usque liquescit*, insert Lm. after [474] or 510, and 475 before *et pariter*; liii, VI 812 should have Lm. added or be changed to 805; liv, M.'s reading is misquoted on 655; lvi, 875 should be 873, 909-95 should be -15; lvii, add Lm. to 127; lviii, 111 should be 110, 112 should be 111, insert Lm. after 129-140, insert Lm. with figures 97, 230, etc.; lix, VI 921-933 is unintelligible, perhaps it should be 923-935 Lm.; lx, 244 should be 254; lxi, 511 should be 512; lxii, 1143 should be 1141; lxiii, 776 Brg. should be 777; lxiv, I 236 should be III 201 (?), 862 should be 873; lxv, 914 should be 919, add Lm. after 1123; lxvi, VI 660 should be 539 Br. or 619 Lm., the note gives the impression that *sonora* was an emendation of L. Mueller, whereas it was read by Nicc. and 8 others, III 181 should be 781, on 144 the statement of Munro's readings should be reversed, 171 should be 174 and Lm. added; lxvii, 182 should be 172; if, as seems to be the case, where verses are transposed, the numbering is by Lm., i. e. of the codices, this principle should be indicated; 284 should be 274, 238 should be 338, on 386 *ruperat* should be *superat*; lxviii, 528 should be 529; lxix, 514 should be 513 Lm., 549 should be 543, 675 should be 678; lxx, 755 should be 748, VI 518 should be II 518; lxxi, 977 should be 966, 1035 should be 1036; lxxii, 1077 should be 1069, add Lm. after 1131; lxxiii, 1253 add OQ after *parent*, 1302 should be (1315 Lm.) not (1313), which is B.; lxxiv, on 1441 sq. insert Mr. before the English quotation; V 613 should be 608; lxxv, M. reads *tigna*, not *ligna*, the lemma 101 should be inserted; lxxvi, 126 should be 127, 240 *monimenta*, the text has *monumenta*; lxxvii, 392 should be 382, III 668 should be 698; lxxix, 771 is given no note, although Br. reads *infestae* against MSS, L. and M., *infesto*; lxxx, 837 should be 833; lxxxi, insert lemma 900 before *lapis*, "[928] Lm. B." unintelligible; B. rejects 935 (928 Br.), which Lm. omits altogether; lxxxiii, 1003 insert Mr. after the third reading, 1097 insert Mr. after *Britanni*, which should be spelled *Brittanni*; lxxxiv, 1167 *inurens* Mr., change Mr. to B.; M. reads *mersans* with Lm.; insert 1195 for lemma before *hac*, etc., 1274 should be 1273.

The footnotes under the text are inconsistent: sometimes the references are to Lachm., sometimes to Br.: p. 102, V 921-933 should be VI 923-935 Lm.; p. 134, 781-790 is Br. (784-793 Lm.); p. 146, 571 should be 570 Lm.; p. 147, 596 = 584, not 583; p. 152, the reference seems to be to Lm.; p. 157, "964 = 967; 966 = 965; 967 = 966 et 968" unintelligible; if italics refer to Bernays, it should read 964 Lm. = 961; 966 Lm. = 963; 957 Br. = 966 et 968; p. 161, 1114 sq. is Br. = 1132, not 1131; the remainder of the note is unintelligible; p. 168, '[1388-1389] = 1452, 1453,' the first numbers are Lm., the second B.; change to 1454-5 Lm.; p. 173, "[56 sq.] = 98 sq. (90 sq.)," this should be 88 sq. Br. (90 sq. Lm.); p. 178, add Lm. after IV 172 sq.; p. 181, [383-385] = 85-87, the first numbers are Lm., the second Br., p. 198, [988 sq.] = 993 sq., the latter number is B.; change to 996 Lm.

Text: I 239 *aeternaquae* should be *aeternaque*; I 404 *prigraris* should be *pigraris*; II 220 *nomen* should be *momen*; II 397 *formina* should be *foramina*; II 1165-70, the figures 1168 and 1173 should be italicized; III 172 *et tamen* for *at tamen* (?); III 551 *licuntur . . . tabe* should be *linquuntur . . . tabi* by p. liii; III 781 *salso* should be *in alto* by lemma p. lv; VI 1126 is inconsistent with the critical note in the proleg. Add the changes desired by the editor in the proleg.: III 594 *facie* for *corpore*; III 811 *fit* for *sit*; V 33 *pelagique* for *pelageque*; V 839 *qua* for *quae*.

Let no man hereafter try to edit a text with three sets of numbers.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

WILLIAM A. MERRILL.

The Saturnian Metre, by W. M. LINDSAY. *American Journal of Philology*, XIV, Nos. 2 and 3.

The July and October numbers of this Journal for the year 1893 contained a valuable paper upon the *Saturnian Metre* by Mr. W. M. Lindsay. In view of the fact that Lindsay's theory of the Saturnian metre has been mentioned with approval by some of our best technical grammars (e. g. Stolz, *Historische Grammatik*, p. 32) and school-grammars, and since in many quarters it is evidently felt that Lindsay's article has settled a much-vexed question, it is worth while to examine his results with some care.

The article in question is comprehensive in its character. It includes the text of the Saturnian fragments, a discussion of certain important matters connected with accentuation and quantity, a criticism of the quantitative theory, and a statement of Lindsay's own theory of the Saturnian metre, with an application of his principles to the extant verses in that metre.

I may say at the outset that, as it seems to me, the merit of Lindsay's discussion lies in his method and in the fact that he brings into the foreground certain important elements of the Saturnian verse which have heretofore either been entirely overlooked or insufficiently considered.

The author's investigation of word-group accent, of primary and secondary accent, and of certain archaic quantities cannot be neglected by any one who is seeking a correct solution of the problems involved in the Saturnian verse. I do not propose, however, in this article to discuss Lindsay's conclusions upon any of these points, nor to consider the general merits of the quantita-